## **REMARKS**

The Examiner has indicated that claims 3, 7 and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Examiner has also indicated that claim 10 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Official Action.

By this amendment, amended claim 1 is the combination of old claim 1 and claim 10. The Examiner rejected claim 1 under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner refers to inconsistencies between line 6 and line 11 which refers to a content identifier that provides information and/or instruction. Claim 1 has been amended to state that the copies of the digital images are made in accordance with said instruction or information. In this regard, the content identifier may provide instructions directly therein or may provide information that is already existing on the database of the recipient which provides instructions. The forming of a copy of the first resolution digital image may be provided with either the instructions or information provided in the content identifier. The instructions do not necessarily have to be provided directly within the content identifier. As previously discussed, the information that the content identifier could refer to is information at the recipient's computer which provides appropriate information for forming the copy of the first resolution digital images.

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 in its amended form, is in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully submitted.

New claims 20 and 21 correspond to the combination of old claims 1 and 3, and old claims 1 and claim 11 respectively. These claims have been indicated as being allowable. Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that these claims are also in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully submitted.

Amended claim 5 is the combination of old claims 5, 6 and 7 which the Examiner has also indicated as being allowable. Claim 5 has also been amended to provide consistent reference to "first" resolution digital images to

clarify the language which is consistent with the specification. (see page 10, lines 7-10). Accordingly, applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 5 is also in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully submitted.

New claim 21 is a combination of old claim 1 and old claim 10. It is respectfully submitted that claim 5 is patentably distinct for the same reasons previously discussed with regard to claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that new claim 21 is allowable.

New claim 22 is a combination of old claim 5 and old claim 11. As previously noted, the Examiner indicated that claim 11 and claim 1 would be allowable. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claim 22 in its present form is also in condition for allowance.

Claims 12-19 have been cancelled from the instant application. In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully submits that only the allowable claims are currently present in the subject application. Accordingly, the allowance of the subject application is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner disagree that the present application is in condition for allowance, applicant encourages the undersigned to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Attorney for Applicant(s) Registration No. 27,370

Frank Pincelli/djw

Rochester, NY 14650 Telephone: 585-588-2728 Facsimile: 585-477-4646

If the Examiner is unable to reach the Applicant(s) Attorney at the telephone number provided, the Examiner is requested to communicate with Eastman Kodak Company Patent Operations at

(585) 477-4656.